



1

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231
Fee Bearing Amendment / Response

#5
Spa/rz

By US EXPRESS mail article ET663103674US on May 16, 2002, see
page 13 for Certificate.

Re: Patent Application of Brad A. Armstrong
Serial No.: 09/955,838
Filed: 09/18/01

Title: ANALOG SENSOR(S) WITH SNAP-THROUGH TACTILE FEEDBACK
Examiner: Karl Easthom
GAU: 2832

RECEIVED
MAY 23 2002
TC 2800 MAIL ROOM

Dear Sir:

REMARKS

This is responsive to the First Office Action, dated and mailed 05/03/2002, on the merits of my application 09/955,838. Please reexamine the application in view of the herein remarks and any amendments such as the recording of the Terminal Disclaimers, and find the application in condition of allowance. Thank you.

Regarding points 1, 2, 3 and 8 of the Office Action:
With the filing of the instant application on 09/18/2001, Applicant submitted three Terminal Disclaimers and the fee payments for recording. Such was discussed on page 2 of the written Information Disclosure Statement submitted on 09/18/2001 by Applicant. There does not seem to be any mention of these disclaimers in the Office Action. Did the Examiner see these? The "best" information available at that time was applied to the Terminal Disclaimers, in that, the instant application did not yet have an application number or a filing date, thus the instant application is identified on the Terminal Disclaimers by the Title. The Examiner is invited / requested (if necessary) to fill-in the instant application number and filing date on the

three Terminal Disclaimers if he wishes, or if there is a Rule requiring such, notify Applicant to submit new more updated Terminal Disclaimers if needed. Thank you.

With the submission of the three Terminal Disclaimers, the Patent issuing from the instant application was not to extend beyond the full statutory period of U.S. Patent 5,999,084, and/or that of any patent issuing on patent applications 09/599,095 and 09/510,572, both of which were pending at that time. Subsequently, application 09/599,095 has issued as U.S. Patent 6,344,791, and application 09/510,572 has issued as U.S. Patent 6,343,991. Since the three Terminal Disclaimers were filed using the "best" information available at the time, since Applicant paid the fees therefore, and since it is not improper by any Rule known to Applicant to submit the Terminal Disclaimers when and in the manner submitted, would the Examiner please be so kind as to either have the Terminal Disclaimers recorded or state they are not necessary. Thank you.

Regarding the Terminal Disclaimers mentioned in the Office Action as being required to disclaim the terminal portion of any patent issuing from the instant application which would extend beyond the full statutory period of my U.S. Patent 5,999,084 and my U.S. Patent 6,351,205: As mentioned above, a Terminal Disclaimer regarding Patent 5,999,084 has been previously submitted and paid for at \$55.00. Regarding Patent 6,351,205: included herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer regarding such, and the fee payment therefore. Please enter and record these Terminal Disclaimers, and withdraw all Double Patenting based rejections. Thank you.

Applicant submits the Terminal Disclaimers only to cooperate with the public policy goal "to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees", and not because Applicant agrees or admits the claims are obvious over one another, because Applicant does not agree or admit such. Thank you.